

REMARKS

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application.

Claim 22 has been amended herewith. Applicants submit no new matter has been added by way of this amendment.

Claims 22, 24, 27, and 29 stand rejected as follows.

Claims 22 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Morris *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,514,122), or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Morris *et al.* (U.S. Pat. No. 5,514,122). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request withdrawal of same.

Applicants' invention teaches an aqueous adhesive composition and an article comprising same wherein the adhesive is transfer coatable, and removable or repositionable, having an aqueous suspension of solid polymeric acrylic microspheres produced by a process using a non-free radically polymerizable acid.

Morris teaches a disposable absorbent article having hollow polymeric microspheres, where the microspheres are produced using free radically polymerizable monomers of acrylate, methacrylate, or vinyl ester. Morris does not teach or suggest a transfer coatable, and removable or repositionable adhesive composition having solid microspheres produced using a non-free radically polymerizable acid.

The Examiner has previously noted in the Advisory Action mailed July 9, 2004, that Morris also discloses solid microspheres produced by a one-step emulsification process. Applicants assert that the microspheres discussed in Morris as referenced by the Examiner at column 4, lines 58-65, differ from Applicants' invention as claimed. The solid microspheres of Applicants' invention are not produced by the one-step process discussed in Morris, nor do the microspheres in Morris contain the same compositions as the spheres in Applicants' invention at least as defined in Claim 22. Further, the data provided in Applicants' specification at least in Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 demonstrate the superior qualities of the adhesives produced in accordance with Applicants' invention.

Applicants maintain that Morris does not teach or suggest the adhesive composition and article of Applicants' invention. All elements of Applicants' invention are not provided by Morris. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is not supported. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicants further maintain that Morris does not teach or suggest the adhesive composition and article of Applicants' invention containing removable or repositionable transfer coatable aqueous adhesive compositions having solid polymeric microspheres, which is produced using a non-free radically polymerizable acid.. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been shown. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is not supported. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 24 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Morris *et al.* Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and request withdrawal of same.

Applicants' invention teaches a transfer coatable, removable or repositionable adhesive composition and article as described above. Claims 24 and 29 are dependent claims teaching a specific dry film peel value range for the composition and article, respectively.

Morris teaches a disposable absorbent article having hollow polymeric microspheres, where the microspheres are produced using free radically polymerizable monomers of acrylate, methacrylate, or vinyl ester. Morris does not teach or suggest transfer coatable, removable or repositionable adhesives prepared using a non-free radically polymerizable acid, nor adhesives having any specified dry film peel value. Applicants maintain the Examiner is incorrect in asserting that the similarity in compositions of Applicants' invention and those provided in Morris would lead one to believe that the adhesive compositions of Morris must inherently have a peel force within the claimed range. Applicants assert that the adhesive compositions are produced by different processes as discussed above, are different compositions, and have different properties and functions. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by

or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Morris *et al.* are not supported. All elements of Applicants invention are not provided by Morris. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is not supported. ✓


Applicants further maintain that Morris does not teach or suggest the adhesive composition and article of Applicants' invention containing removable or repositionable transfer coatable aqueous adhesive compositions having solid polymeric microspheres, which are produced using a non-free radically polymerizable acid, and further having a specific dry film peel value range for the composition and article, respectively. *A prima facie* case of obviousness has not been shown. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is not supported. Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

CONCLUSIONS

Should the Examiner believe that issues remain outstanding, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' undersigned attorney in an effort to resolve such issues and advance this application to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

LATHROP & GAGE L.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Janelle D. Strode", is written over a horizontal line.

Janelle D. Strode, Reg. No. 34,738

2345 Grand Boulevard, Suite 2400

Kansas City, MO 64108-2612

Tel: (816) 460-5859

Fax: (816) 292-2001

Attorney for Applicants